

---

Remarks

The paragraphs of the Office action are responded to through the corresponding numbered paragraphs below. The applicant has addressed each issue in turn and, for clarity, has provided a heading for each issue.

1. The Examiner indicated that this action is in response to the Applicants' filing request for continued examination on 10/20/2004 and that claims 1 and 3-18 remain pending in this application.

*Response to Arguments*

2. The Examiner stated that the Applicants' arguments "have been fully considered" but that "a claimed limitation should impart functionality in order to distinguish over prior art." The applicants appreciate the Examiner's consideration and believes that the amendments requested in this response provide the required functionality.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

3. The Examiner provided the citation to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) "which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action." The applicants believe that no specific response is required for this paragraph.

4. The Examiner rejected claims 1 and 4-18 under "35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kahani, WWWCopy™ Version 1.1" in view of *Inside the Internet*, "Create self-extracting ZIP files with WinZip 6.3". While, as previously noted, the applicants have reviewed the cited reference and have identified several elements of claim 1, on which claims 4-18 depends and which therefore include all of the limitations of claim 1, that are neither described or even suggested by the cited references either alone or in combination, the applicant has requested that claim 1, on which claims 4-18 depend, be amended to more clearly point out the specific functional elements of the migrating means. The applicant believes that these elements in combination are neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references either alone or in combination. Since, claims are dependent upon claim 1 they include the limitations of claims 1. Accordingly, the applicants believe that the requested amendment and these remarks are fully responsive to the rejections of this paragraph. Therefore, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

5. The Examiner rejected claim 3 "under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being upatentable over Inside the Internet, 'Create self-extracting ZIP files with WinZip 6.3' (ProQuest

Computing), in view of WinZip Version 7.0 (Nico Mak Computing)." The applicant has requested that claim 3 be amended to more clearly point out that applicant's invention includes determining if a file is a shell link, if it is adding the file to the shell link list, and updating the shell links using the shell link list. The applicants believe that the elements recited in this amended claim are neither described or suggested by any of the cited references either alone or in combination. Accordingly, the applicants believe that the requested amendment and these remarks are fully responsive to the rejections of this paragraph. Therefore, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection.

*Conclusion*

6. The Examiner has provided information concerning communication and/or inquiries concerning this case. Applicant appreciates the Examiner's willingness to communicate and assist on this case and believes no response to this paragraph is necessary.

The applicants have requested that claims 1 (on which claims 4-18 depend), and 3-6 be amended as described and has canceled claims 8 and 9. The applicants believe that the claims as currently pending do not appear to be found, described or suggested by the cited references. Accordingly, the applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims. The applicants believe that all paragraphs and rejections of the pending Office action have been responded to and that therefore this Office action response is fully responsive to the pending Office action.

The applicant believes that all issues and points of the Examiner's Office action have been addressed. Applicant believes that claims 1 and 3-18 are patentable over all known prior art. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted this 9th day of September, 2005



Lloyd W. Sadler, Reg. No. 40,154  
SNELL & WILMER, L.L.P.  
15 West South Temple, Suite 1200  
Gateway Tower West  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84101  
Telephone: (801)257-1900  
Facsimile: (801)257-1800